

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Please replace drawing sheets containing Figures 6(a)-6(c) with new Replacement sheets.

## **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner first objected to informalities in the drawing figures, and particularly objected to drawing sheets having Figures 6(a)-6(c) as being allegedly not in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(u)(1). In response, applicants submit new Replacement Sheets including labeling of Figures 6(a)-6(c) as FIGs. 6A-6C. Respectfully, it is believed that the drawing figures are now in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(u)(1) and the Examiner is respectfully requested to remove the objection to the drawings.

In the Office Action, the Examiner further objected to the specification paragraph [0001] as requiring updated information, namely, the cross-reference to now issued United States Patents. In response, applicants provide a further amendment to the specification to add this cross-reference to related issued U.S. Patents.

Further in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. §101 on double patenting grounds as allegedly including identical claims as in corresponding parent case U.S. Patent No. 6,665,787.

Applicants respectfully disagree.


The present invention as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 19 do not have identical counterparts in corresponding parent case U.S. Patent No. 6,665,787 as alleged by the Examiner. For example, in Claim 1, there is included a limitation in the claim directed to a “control device for directly manipulating entries in said translation table structure for performing block swap, block move and block clear page operations for all blocks in a page...”.

Respectfully, Claim 1 of corresponding parent case U.S. Patent No. 6,665,787 does not include the limitation of performing ... block clear page operations. This added limitation turns out to be the additional subject matter in the present C-I-P application. Similarly, Claim 19 includes the similar limitation "directly manipulating entries in said translation table structure for performing a block swap, block move and block clear page operation ... Respectfully, Claim 19 of corresponding parent case U.S. Patent No. 6,665,787 does not include the limitation of performing a ... block clear page operations.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the double patenting rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 on double patenting grounds as allegedly including identical claims as in corresponding parent case U.S. Patent No. 6,665,787 be withdrawn.

Wherefore reconsideration and allowance of the claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Steven Fischman  
Registration No. 34,594

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

SF:gc  
Enclosures